Office of Land Quality Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage and Disposal Facilities Class 2 and Class 3 Permit Modifications Number of Days to Issue Final Decision

January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2002

Decisions Issued on Applications for Class 2 Modification

Site Name	County	Date Application Received	Decision	Date of Decision	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	# of Days to Issue Decision
Ashland Distribution	St. Joseph	1/30/02	Approved	5/3/02	120	57
HES (INR 02-1)	Putnam	2/6/02	Approved	6/26/02	120	99
HES (INR 02-3)	Putnam	2/6/02	Approved	12/16/02	120	120
HES (INR 02-4)	Putnam	5/9/02	Approved	9/16/02	120	62

^{**} The "Median number of days to Issue Final Decisions" on Class 2 Permit Modifications during the past 12 months was 84 days.

Class 2 Modifications apply to changes to the permit which are necessary to enable the permittee to respond, in a timely manner, to

- 1) Common variations in the types and quantities of wastes managed under the facility's permit;
- 2) Technology advancements, and
- 3) Changes necessary to comply with new regulations.

Decisions Issued on Applications for Class 3 Modification

		Date			Review	
		Application			Deadline (in	# of Days to Issue
Site Name	County	Received	Decision	Date of Decision	days)	Decision
HES	Marion	10/8/1999	Approved	2/14/02	270	270*
Eli Lilly & Co.	Tippecanoe	7/2/2001	Approved	6/28/02	270	266

^{**} The "Median number of days to Issue Final Decisions" on Class 3 Permit Modifications during the past 12 months was 268 days.

Class 3 Modifications substantially alter the facility or its operation. Applications for modifications to landfills must be processed in 365 days, while applications for modifications to storage, treatment or incinerator facilities must be processed 270 days.

^{*} Although 476 days elapsed on the clock prior to the issuance of the modification approval, the modification approval was not late because a 60-day extension was granted for additional public comment. In addition, the applicant agreed to add time to the clock because what they proposed to do in their response to Office of Land Quality's request for additional information was substantially different from what they had proposed in their initial application.